UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FLORENCE DIVISION

United States of America,)	
)	Criminal Case No.: 12-cr-969-RBH
vs.)	
)	ORDER
Webster Douglas Williams, III,)	
)	

Pending before the court is Notice of Appeal (ECF No.48) by Defendant, Webster Douglas Williams, III, from the Order of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, denying bond, entered in this action on May 20, 2013.

A district court reviews a Magistrate Judge's ruling on pretrial detention *de novo*. *United States v. Williams*, 753 F.2d 329, 331 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Stewart*, 19 Fed. Appx.46 (4th Cir. 2001)(citing *United States v. Rueben*, 974 F.2d 580, 585-86 (5th Cir. 1992)).

In accordance with the appropriate standard of review, the court reviewed the transcript of the testimony of the detention hearing proceedings before the Magistrate Judge, as well as the Order of the Magistrate Judge. In addition, the court has reviewed the Statement in Support of Appeal of Detention Order with attached information regarding Defendant's health issues and regarding passport submitted by the defendant. Finally, the court has reviewed the government's memorandum with attached exhibit.

The court agrees with the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge as set forth in his written Order of Detention and as explained on the record at the detention hearing. Accordingly, after having conducted a *de novo* review of the record, the court finds that application of the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) supports the Magistrate Judge's conclusion that pretrial detention of this defendant is appropriate in this case.

4:12-cr-00969-RBH Date Filed 07/25/13 Entry Number 61 Page 2 of 2

The court hereby adopts and incorporates the findings of the Magistrate Judge and affirms the Pretrial Detention Order [163]. Defendant's appeal is DENIED. The court denies the defendant's request for a hearing, as the transcript and record have been reviewed *de novo*, and a hearing is not necessary. In addition, no change of circumstances has been alleged to warrant revocation of the detention order.

In light of the court's order denying Defendant's appeal of the pretrial detention order, the court will schedule this case for trial as soon as reasonably possible and at the next term of court if requested by counsel and subject to the court's ruling on the pending motion to suppress. A hearing on the defendant' motion to suppress is scheduled for August 20, 2013.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

July 25, 2013 Florence, SC s/R. Bryan HarwellR. Bryan HarwellUnited States District Judge